



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/666,642	09/21/2000	Hu Yang	2039.008200	9201
32223	7590	01/31/2006	EXAMINER	
CHEVRON PHILLIPS CHEMICAL COMPANY LP			MULLIS, JEFFREY C	
LAW DEPARTMENT - IP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O BOX 4910			1711	
THE WOODLANDS, TX 77387-4910				

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/666,642	YANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) are 1-4, 7, 10, 11, 15-30, 33, 36, 37, 41-66, 70-73, 76, 80, 84-91, 94, 97, 98 and 102-115. is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-4,7,10,11,15-30,33,36,37,41-66,70-73,76,80,84-91,94,97,98 and 102-115.

Claims 1-4,7,10,11,15-30,33,36,37,41-66,70-73,76,80,84-91,94,97,98 and 102-115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Nothing appearing to be an "r" appears in the structure of the claims nor is it clear what the symbols in the 3 and 4 position of the cyclohexene ring are (they appear to be illegible if they are in fact supposed to be "r"). Also the moiety "R" is undefined.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4,7,10,11,15-30,33,36,37,41-66,70-73,76,80,84-91,94,97,98 and 102-115 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,818,151. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the oxygen scavenging polymers are disclosed to include applicants at column 4, lines 25-

45 and this portion of the specification can thus be read into the patented claims given that it supports the claimed genus; claim 10 discloses use of barrier polymer PVDC.

Claims 1-4,7,10,11,15-30,33,36,37,41-66,70-73,76,80,84-91,94,97,98 and 102-115 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 36-50 of U.S. Patent No. 6,559,205. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the scope of the claims overlap.

Claims 1-4,7,10,11,15-30,33,36,37,41-66,70-73,76,80,84-91,94,97,98 and 102-115 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-56 of U.S. Patent No. 6,437,086. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the scope of the claims overlap.

Claims 1-4,7,10,11,15-30,33,36,37,41-66,70-73,76,80,84-91,94,97,98 and 102-115 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-58 of copending Application No. 09/760,620. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the scope of the claims overlap.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-4,7,10,11,15-30,33,36,37,41-66,70-73,76,80,84-91,94,97,98 and 102-115 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 36-49 of copending Application No. 09/800418.

Art Unit: 1711

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the scope of the claims overlap.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey C. Mullis at telephone number 571 272 1075.

Jeffrey C. Mullis
J Mullis
Art Unit 1711

JCM

1-6-06

JEFFREY C. MULLIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200



1711